DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 582 HE 000 749

By-Dyer, Henry S.

The Agony and The Promise of Higher Education as Seen Through ETS Research.

American Association for Higher Education, Washington, D.C.

Pub Date 3 Mar 69

Note-8p.; Summary of statement presented at the 24th National Conference on Higher Education, March 3, 1969, Chicago, Illinois

EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.50

Descriptors-•Activism, •Change Agents, Conflict, •Educational Improvement, Higher Education, •Institutional Administration, •Student Reaction

Some studies conducted by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) have revealed possible causes of the uprisings on college and university campuses, and others suggest possible remedies for the agony experienced at many institutions. A survey of 5,200 college and university trustees shows that the ambivalence in their beliefs and attitudes, and the conflicting views among them as well as between them and other members of the academic community, may have contributed to campus turbulence. One of the most important findings in a study of 180 university presidents in New York State is an admitted discrepancy between their perceived accomplishment and their recognized responsibility. An examination of the relationships between 6 types of organized student protest and 5 measures of institutional climate --as perceived by students at 109 four-year colleges--reveals a strong relationship between the incidence and the intensity of student protests on 2 sets of off-campus issues: civil rights and US militarism. In the same study it was found that on those campuses where there is a strong concern for national and international affairs, and on those where scholarly attainment is valued highly, one is more likely to find students who are active in promoting the rights of black people or in demonstrating against the US involvement in Vietnam. It is felt that campus disorders may possibly be necessary ingredients of institutional progress toward excellence. (WM)

ED029582

Information Session F
Monday Evening, March 3

THE AGONY AND THE PROMISE OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS SEEN THROUGH ETS RESEARCH*

Henry S. Dyer
Vice President
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, New Jersey

This talk is about those studies at ETS that in one way or another have touched on the main theme of this conference, to wit: (1) studies that have turned up something of interest about the manifestations and probable causes of agony on college and university campuses and (2) studies that suggest remedies having some promise for reducing the agony. My remarks will weave in and around and through the five agonized layers of the academic community: trustees, presidents, other administrative officers, faculty, and students. I do not think we have done any studies involving the agonies of nonacademic personnel, such as office and maintenance workers and campus police, but I could be wrong about this, since I am reasonably certain I have not unearthed all the relevant studies that all ETS researchers have been carrying on.

Let me begin with Rodney Hartnett's recently reported study of college and university trustees.[10] This study is based on a sample of 5200 trustees drawn from the full spectrum of higher education ranging from two-year community colleges to Ph.D. granting universities in all the regions of the United States. They replied to a questionnaire that gave information about their status in life, their political beliefs, and their views on such matters as the authority structure of their institutions, academic freedom, admissions, and student power. Although a first report on the study appeared a few weeks ago, and was attended by considerable publicity, much remains to be done with the data in order to get the full flavor of the impact of the trusteeship on American higher education. Nevertheless, some of the first findings are of considerable interest.

Most trustees think that they or the administration or both together should have practically exclusive control over such matters as the appointment of presidents and deans, decisions about student tuition and faculty tenure, and the determination of policy regarding student protests. They would leave questions about curriculum and admissions to the administration and the faculty. Only about one-third are willing to let students have a major voice in deciding matters having to do with parietal rules, cheating, and fraternities and sororities. This, however, is only the general picture of their attitudes on governance of their institutions. When one breaks out the data by institutional types, some dramatic differences turn up. For example, the trustees of highly selective private institutions are far less inclined than those in public institutions to mess around with curriculum matters, tenure decisions, leaves of absence, and admissions criteria.

Trustees' attitudes toward admissions appear somewhat inconsistent. Seventy percent think that all applicants should be screened on the basis of aptitude tests, and

*Summary of statement presented to Information Session F on "Research studies in higher education" at the 24th National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the American Association for Higher Education, Chicago, Monday evening, March 3.
Permission to quote restricted.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 000 149

over 90 percent think that attendance at their college should be regarded as a privilege rather than a right. At the same time, however, 85 percent say that anyone desiring higher education should have it, and nearly two-thirds are for making special concessions to disadvantaged youngsters. There are various ways of explaining away these apparent inconsistencies, and Rod Hartnett makes a good try at it, but one cannot help but wonder whether there may not be a residue of ambivalence in these matters which may be contributing to the agony of the trustees themselves as well as to the rest of the academic community.

On matters of academic freedom the reactions are similarly mixed. Two-thirds of the trustees think faculty have a right to free expression of opinion, but a majority also think that campus speakers should be screened and that the content of student publications should be controlled by the administration. The tendency is to grant more freedom to faculty than to students. In these matters, however, there are some interesting differences among regions and institutional types. Trustees in the Northeast, for example, seem to be considerably more liberal than those in other sections, and trustees of public junior colleges are usually more conservative than those who serve other types of institutions.

Hartnett points out an interesting disjunction between the political preferences of trustees and those of their faculties. Most trustees are moderate or conservative Republicans; most faculty members are Democrats or some kind of liberal.

To sum up, the general contours of the data as they now stand suggest that some part at least of the underlying causes of campus turbulence can be attributed to the ambivalencies that trustees bring to their own task and to conflicting views among themselves and between themselves and other members of the academic community.

Presidents also have problems which seem to bear on the issue. In a study of 180 out of the 206 presidents in the State of New York, John Hemphill and Herbert Walberg,[11] both formerly of ETS, came up with the conclusion, based on both questionnaire and interview data, that although some 82 percent of the presidents thought their main job ought to be that of shaping the purposes of their institution and facilitating the work of their faculties, only 29 percent felt that the performance of this job was the main area of their accomplishment. Most of them felt they were bogged down in administrative detail and the problems attendant upon physical growth, image making, and trying to get enough money to balance budgets. As the authors say, "This discrepancy between perceived accomplishment and recognized responsibility is clearly one of the most important facts documented by the study." (p. 71)

Most of these apparently guilt-ridden presidents get along rather well with their governing boards. Less than one-quarter of them said they had encountered opposition from their board members in doing the job they would like to do (p. 56). At the same time, however, most of them seemed rather unhappy about the manner in which the trustees had selected them for the job in the first place. In the selection process, according to Hemphill and Walberg, "Many presidents learned little... about the position they were considering and noted that the board of trustees learned little about them." (p. 73). One might suppose that this sort of blind-man's bluff could contribute substantially to the agony of institutional leadership. The fact, however, that it has been noted and that the report of the study contains strong and specific recommendations for eliminating it may hold some promise for the future.

As for academic freedom, only one percent of the presidents subscribe to the idea that "a faculty member has no academic freedom, but instead should subordinate his teaching to the purposes of the institution." (p. 36) Sixty-five percent are either for complete freedom or freedom with "liberal limits" determined by the

president. (p. 36)

Other presidential worries that emerged from the study in considerable amounts are (1) the insufficiency of the teaching faculty in respect to both numbers and competence (2) the presence of too many students on the campus (3) lack of quality among the applicants for admission and (4)(note this!) excessive "student apathy and disinterest in college work." (p. 55) Inasmuch as this study of presidents was completed midway between the first uprising at Berkeley and the crisis at Columbia, one cannot help wondering whether the presidential concerns about student apathy may not have changed somewhat during the last two years.

The only information we seem to have on the institutional agony generated in and by administrative officers other than the president has been turned up as a by-product of a series of studies of the Advanced Placement Program conducted by Patricia Casserly, Richard Peterson, and William Coffman.[1, 2, 3, 4, 15] The first set of studies consisted of intensive interviews with officials in 63 colleges in 22 states. The second set, coming two years later, consisted of similar interviews with 358 AP students in 20 colleges known to have had considerable experience with such students. The main purpose was to find out in some detail how the colleges were responding to the Program. However, these studies tend to support an agonizing hypothesis about intrainstitutional communication that goes well beyond the specifics of advanced placement. The hypothesis is that in a good many colleges the flow of necessary information among administrative officers, faculty, and students is often faulty and in some cases nonexistent.

For instance, it became apparent that in only about one-third of the colleges visited were the faculty members and administrators adequately informed about the program. In large institutions particularly the literature explaining the program, its purposes, and its operations remained in the files of the dean, registrar, or admissions officer to whom it was sent, and never got to those faculty members who were responsible for making or carrying out decisions regarding the program. A large number of the institutions had no regular system for apprising entering AP students of decisions about advanced placement. In half the institutions visited AP students reported that they did not find out whether the college had recognized their AP work until they spoke with their freshman advisors, and in only fifteen percent did they find the advice they got helpful or the options meaningful.

On the plus side, however, most of the AP students appeared to survive the administrative confusion and managed to fulfill the promise of the Program. According to one interviewer, most of them were "involved in some way with their culture -- trying to improve and enrich it or at least understand it. Almost none of them were militantly rejecting it or withdrawing from it. In general, resident students of colleges that awarded them proper placement and afforded them flexible curriculums were most apt to be actively involved in the larger social issues both on the local campus and in the larger society." (No. 70, p. 18)

Advanced placement students, of course, represent the intellectual cream among those entering four-year colleges. How are those students faring who are entering junior colleges and who are usually thought -- sometimes mistakenly I suspect -- to be at the other end of the continuum? Patricia Cross has recently completed a synthesis of the research literature bearing on this question.[5] Her report covers such matters as the academic characteristics of the students, their socioeconomic background, their interests and aspirations, and their reactions to college. The general impression she gets is that, by and large, the junior colleges tend to be more academically oriented than vocationally oriented, while the majority of the students who attend them are looking for practical salable skills at the end of the

two years, whether they realize it or not. And those who do not realize it are likely to have unrealistic academic aspirations. As a consequence, she finds that "junior college students appear to be more unsettled about future plans than either the four-year college or noncollege groups." (p. 50) She says that "we have not really explored the range of activities in which the junior college student may feel he excels" and that he emerges from the research on him "looking unsure of himself and lacking in self confidence." (p. 51) She concludes that "If we wish to avoid a weak senior college prescription to the junior college student, then we must begin the long and difficult search for new measures and new programs designed /especially/ for him." (p. 53)

This "long and difficult search" has been begun at ETS on behalf of the College Board in an experimental program for junior colleges known as the Comparative Guidance and Placement Program.[7] This is really a whole series of studies aimed at developing measures and predictive indices that will help counselors help the entering junior college student sort out quickly the curricula that are best suited to his needs, abilities, and true aspirations and to get him placed at the appropriate level in the basic skills courses in English and mathematics. The first phase of the study,[9] which is only just now nearing completion, has involved the testing and first-year follow-up of some 16,000 students who entered 39 junior colleges of various types and with varied curricula a year and a half ago. They took a wide variety of experimental tests aimed not only at their general intellectual ability but also their learning styles, motivations, interests, and special competencies.

From the standpoint of the researcher, these studies may have a special fascination, for they bring together the best current thinking in measurement and multivariate analysis relevant to the problem. From the standpoint of the junior colleges and the great body of students they are intended to serve, the studies thus far suggest that the educational promise of the junior college as an important segment of higher education can eventually be realized.

My time, you will notice, is rapidly running out. I would have liked to talk about Jay Davis's studies of how faculty members perceive their students and some of the subsurface agonies involved when they feel they have to give low grades to many students whom they admire and high grades to those for whom they have less regard.[6] I would have liked to tell about the still unpublished study by Donald Rock, John Centra, and Robert Linn on The Identification and Evaluation of College Effects on Student Achievement, and all that it implies about the agonizing futility of judging the differential effectiveness of colleges in terms of "value added" as measured solely by the residual variance in GRE scores.[16] And there are still others that I hate to pass over if only because to neglect them will agonize some hard-working colleagues back home. But if I am going to keep my promise and stay within the 20-minute time limit, I shall have to put up with the agony of mentioning only two more studies that have to do with student unrest and the nature of the institutions at which it tends to occur.

The first study, reported last spring by Masu Säsajima, Jay Davis, and Dick Peterson, examined the relationships between six types of organized student protest and five measures of institutional climate as perceived by students at 109 representative four-year colleges.[17] The measures of student protest were obtained from Peterson's first survey which covered the various forms of organized protest that occurred in 1964-65, as reported by college deans.[13] They indicated the incidence and intensity of protest on 27 issues. A factor analysis of their responses produced internally consistent scales indicative of the degree of protest on six groups of issues: quality of instruction (e.g., large, impersonal

undergraduate classes), faculty affairs (e.g., publish-or-perish policies), administrative paternalism (e.g., censorship of student publications), politically extremist visitors (e.g., Herbert Marcuse), civil rights (e.g., voter registration of Blacks), and U.S. militarism (e.g., protests against the Vietnam War). The authors correlated these six measures with the five College and University Environment Scales developed by Robert Pace:[12] practicality, community, awareness, propriety, and scholarship. I shall assume that you are all familiar with the nature of each of these five scales.*

The most striking finding of the study is the strong relationship between the awareness scale and the incidence and intensity of student protests on the two sets of off-campus issues: civil rights and U.S. militarism. That is, those campus environments characterized by a strong interest and concern for national and international affairs are far more likely to be the ones in which students are active in promoting the rights of Blacks or in demonstrating against the U.S. involvement in Vietnam. Campuses where scholarly attainment is highly valued tend also to be those where protests on such off-campus issues occur. By contrast, those colleges where the climate is one of practicality, orderliness, conventional behavior, and lack of interest in ideas tend to be the ones in which eruptions over civil rights and U.S. military involvements are least likely to occur.

Another striking finding from the study is the degree to which these two kinds of protest are predictable from a combination of the CUES scales. By combining the scores on the awareness and community scales with appropriate weights it is possible, for instance, to predict the incidence of protest against U.S. militarism with a degree of accuracy that accounts for fifty percent of the variance.

A third finding is also of considerable interest in that it is negative. Generally speaking the CUES scales are not significantly predictive of protests having to do with matters related to the quality of instruction, faculty affairs, administrative paternalism, and the visits of extremists.

There are obviously a good many implications of this study that might be fruitfully explored, but I must pass on to one more study of student protest that it still in

*1. Practicality. The degree to which the institutional environment is perceived by students as structured and orderly, where rules and procedures are important, and where interest in ideas for their own sake tends to be deemphasized.

2. Community. The degree to which they perceive the institution as having a warm, cohesive atmosphere and close relationships between students and faculty and among students.

3. Awareness. The degree to which they perceive the college as having an interest in philosophy, the arts, and a concern for national and international affairs, that evidences personal awareness in relation to society.

4. Propriety. The degree to which they perceive proper forms, conventions, and good manners as being emphasized together with an absence of unconventional behavior.

5. Scholarship. The degree to which they perceive an emphasis on the pursuit of knowledge and ideas and the placement of a high value on scholarly achievement.

the works but for which the first analyses of the data are highly provocative. This study involved 50 institutions for which we had data from two sources: Peterson's second survey of organized student protest in 1967-68[14] and a new instrument known as the Institutional Functioning Inventory.[8] This is an instrument developed by Dick Peterson, Rod Hartnett, John Centra, and Robert Linn at the request of Earl McGrath in connection with his study of institutional vitality. The background of its development is too long to discuss here except to say that the purpose was to get a series of measures of the ways colleges and universities operate by relying primarily on the perceptions of their faculties. The Institutional Functioning Inventory yields eleven scales labeled as follows: intellectual-aesthetic extracurriculum, freedom, human diversity, concern for improvement of society, concern for undergraduate learning, democratic governance, meeting local needs (i.e., needs outside the institution itself), self-study and planning, concern for advancing knowledge, concern for innovation, and institutional esprit.* I shall not attempt to describe all these variables, but only say that the Inventory provides measures of each of them that are remarkably reliable (the reliability of means ranges from .81 to .97).

Some of the relationships between scores on the Institutional Functioning Inventory and the incidence of student protest are of particular interest because they indicate some fairly strong connections between the way institutions behave and the

*Brief descriptions of the variables are as follows: (1) Intellectual-Aesthetic Extracurriculum refers to the availability of activities and opportunities for intellectual and aesthetic stimulation outside the classroom. (2) Freedom has to do with academic freedom for faculty and students as well as freedom in their personal lives for all individuals in the campus community. (3) Human Diversity has to do with the degree to which the faculty and student body are heterogeneous in their backgrounds and present attitudes. (4) Concern for Improvement of Society refers to a desire among people at the institution to apply their knowledge and skills in solving social problems and prompting social change. (5) Concern for Undergraduate Learning has to do with the degree to which the college -- in its structure, function, and professional commitment of faculty-emphasizes undergraduate teaching and learning. (6) Democratic Governance has to do with the extent to which individuals in the campus community who are directly affected by a decision have the opportunity to participate in making the decision. (7) Meeting Local Needs refers to an institutional emphasis on providing educational and cultural opportunities for all adults in the surrounding area, as well as meeting needs for trained manpower on the part of local businesses and government agencies. (8) Self-study and Planning has to do with the importance college leaders attach to continuous long-range planning for the total institution, and to institutional research needed in formulating and revising plans. (9) Concern for Advancing Knowledge has to do with the degree to which the institution -- in its structure, function, and professional commitment of faculty -- emphasizes research and scholarship aimed at extending the scope of human knowledge. (10) Concern for Innovation refers, in its highest form, to an institutionalized commitment to experimentation with new ideas for educational practice. (11) Institutional Esprit refers to a sense of shared purpose and high morale among faculty and administrators.

way students behave. For example, those institutions in which the faculty is deeply committed to research and scholarship tend to be precisely the ones where students raise Cain about the absenteeism of senior faculty members. By the same token, when faculties admit that their university has only a lukewarm interest in undergraduate instruction, they can expect that undergraduates will become noisy about the quality of such instruction. Perhaps of even more interest is the fact that if a college is characterized by its faculty as one where a high degree of academic freedom prevails, it will tend to have a minimum amount of student trouble over such matters as the barring of radical speakers from the campus. Or again, if an institution is accustomed to involve students and faculty in the making of decisions that directly affect them, it is likely to find itself relatively free of protests over rules about how undergraduates shall dress or wear their hair. On the other hand, at a college where the faculty has a strong commitment to applying its expertise to solving social problems and bringing about social change, one can be fairly sure that demonstrations against the Vietnam war will be prominent and frequent. Finally, as a last example, the institutions inhabited by a faculty and student body highly diverse in social background and attitudes may well be prone to a considerable amount of turbulence when recruiters from Dow Chemical and the armed services set up shop in college buildings.

All of these results seem to make sense, but they need far more intensive analysis before they can be adequately understood. Nevertheless, as the data now stand, they suggest the not altogether comforting thought that at least some of the current institutional agony may just possibly be a necessary ingredient of progress toward genuine institutional excellence.

REFERENCES

1. Casserly, Patricia L. "What College Students Say About Advanced Placement -- Part I." College Board Review, No. 69, pp. 6-10 and pp. 28-34.

2. Casserly, Patricia L. "What College Students Say About Advanced Placement -- Part II." College Board Review, No. 70, pp. 18-22.

3. Casserly, Patricia L. "What's Really Happening in Advanced Placement - II?" College Board Review, No. 58, pp. 16-22.

4. Casserly, Patricia L., Peterson, Richard E., Coffman, William E. College Decisions on Advanced Placement II: An Interview Survey of Advanced Placement Practices at 63 Colleges. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, RDR-65-6, No. 4, December 1965.

5. Cross, K. Patricia. The Junior College Student: A Research Description. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968. 56 pp.

6. Davis, Junius A. Faculty Perceptions of Students. Research and Development Reports, RDR 63-4, Nos. 7, 8, 9, 10, and 14. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1964 and 1965.

7. Educational Testing Service. Comparative Guidance and Placement Program: An Experimental Program for Junior Colleges. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1968. 90 pp.

8. Educational Testing Service. The Institutional Functioning Inventory. Princeton, N. Y.: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

9. Educational Testing Service. Progress Report: Comparative Guidance and Placement Program Research, Phase I. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, February 1969 (mimeo).

10. Hartnett, Rodney T. College and University Trustees: Their Backgrounds, Roles and Educational Attitudes. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969. 79 pp.

11. Hemphill, John K. and Walberg, Herbert J. College and University Presidents: Recommendations and Report of a Survey. Albany, N. Y.: The New York State Regents Advisory Committee on Educational Leadership, 1967. 73 pp.

12. Pace, C. Robert. CUES: College and University Environment Scales. Technical Manual, Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1963.

13. Peterson, Richard E. The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1964-65. Princeton, N. Y.: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

14. Peterson, Richard E. The Scope of Organized Student Protest in 1967-68. Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

15. Peterson, Richard E. "What's Really Happening In Advanced Placement - I?" College Board Review, No. 58, pp. 12-18.

16. Rock, Donald A., Centra, John A., Linn, Robert L. The Identification and Evaluation of College Effects on Student Achievement. (Final Report to U.S.O.E. Grant No. OEO-0-8-080907-4708 (099)) Princeton, N. J.: Educational Testing Service, 1969 (Mimeo).

17. Säsajima, Masu, Davis, Junius A., Peterson, Richard E. "Organized Student Protest and Institutional Climate." American Educational Research Journal, 5:291-304.